

1 HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON
2
3
4
5
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT TACOMA

10 PARAMJIT SINGH BASRA,

11 Plaintiff,

v.

12 RICHARD MORGAN,

13 Defendant.

CASE NO. C16-6005 RBL

ORDER

14 THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff Basra's Motion for Reconsideration
15 [Dkt. # 88] of the Court's Order [Dkt. # 83] DENYING his Motion for Appointment of Counsel
16 [Dkt. # 79]. Basra emphasizes, again, that he faces "a clear language barrier."

17 Under Local Rule 7(h)(1), motions for reconsideration are disfavored, and will ordinarily
18 be denied unless there is a showing of (a) manifest error in the ruling, or (b) facts or legal
19 authority which could not have been brought to the attention of the court earlier, through
20 reasonable diligence. The term "manifest error" is "an error that is plain and indisputable, and
21 that amounts to a complete disregard of the controlling law or the credible evidence in the
22 record." Black's Law Dictionary 622 (9th ed. 2009).

1 Reconsideration is an “extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of
2 finality and conservation of judicial resources.” *Kona Enters., Inc. v. Estate of Bishop*, 229 F.3d
3 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000). “[A] motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly
4 unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence,
5 committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law.” *Marlyn*
6 *Natraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co.*, 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009). Neither
7 the Local Civil Rules nor the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, which allow for a motion for
8 reconsideration, is intended to provide litigants with a second bite at the apple. A motion for
9 reconsideration should not be used to ask a court to rethink what the court had already thought
10 through — rightly or wrongly. *Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner*, 909 F.Supp. 1342, 1351 (D.
11 Ariz. 1995). Mere disagreement with a previous order is an insufficient basis for reconsideration,
12 and reconsideration may not be based on evidence and legal arguments that could have been
13 presented at the time of the challenged decision. *Haw. Stevedores, Inc. v. HT & T Co.*, 363 F.
14 Supp. 2d 1253, 1269 (D. Haw. 2005). “Whether or not to grant reconsideration is committed to
15 the sound discretion of the court.” *Navajo Nation v. Confederated Tribes & Bands of the Yakima*
16 *Indian Nation*, 331 F.3d 1041, 1046 (9th Cir. 2003).

17 //

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23

24

1 Basra has not met the “manifest error” standard for reconsideration, because claiming a
2 language barrier is not enough to meet the “exceptional circumstances” standard for the
3 appointment of an attorney. The Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated this 11th day of October, 2018.

6 
7

8 Ronald B. Leighton
9 United States District Judge

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24